



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/692,596	10/19/2000	Lily Barkovic Mummert	YOR920000461-US1	8300

7590 05/03/2005

Anne Vachon Dougherty  
3173 Cedar Road  
Yorktown Heights, NY 10598

EXAMINER
----------

TODD, GREGORY G

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2157

DATE MAILED: 05/03/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/692,596

Applicant(s)

MUMMERT ET AL.

Examiner

Gregory G. Todd

Art Unit

2157

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 February 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Amendment***

1. This is a second office action in response to applicant's amendment filed, 07 February 2005, of application filed, with the above serial number, on 19 October 2000 in which claims 1, 10, and 12 have been amended. Claims 1-20 are therefore pending in the application.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Borowsky et al (hereinafter "Borowsky", 6,119,174).

As per Claim 1, Borowsky teaches a method for evaluating workload across a processing environment having a plurality of computer systems each having a plurality of assigned workload units comprising the steps of:

assigning a plurality of impact values, one to each workload unit assigned for each of the plurality of computing systems, said assigning comprising determining the change in system expiration date should each one of said plurality of workload units be

Art Unit: 2157

removed from the system (at least col. 7, lines 30-67; computation of units of the workload distribution); and

assessing the workload based on said impact values (at least col. 7, lines 30-67; issue / reassessing current assignment).

As per Claim 2. The method of Claim 1 wherein the change in system expiration date is determined based on system life expectancy (at least col. 5, lines 27-47; col. 6, lines 3-29; device failure).

As per Claim 3. The method of Claim 1 wherein the change in system expiration date is determined based on capacity space (at least col. 6, lines 3-29; capacity).

As per Claim 4. The method of Claim further comprising sorting said workload units based on said impact values into a sorted impact list (at least col. 8, lines 26-67; queue).

As per Claim 5. The method of Claim 1 further comprising altering the processing environment to change the expiration workload in the dates of at least two of said plurality of computer systems (at least col. 6, lines 40-52; capacity planning for response time).

As per Claim 6. The method of Claim 1 further comprising comparing the expiration date each said plurality of computing systems to at least one target planning date for servicing each of said plurality of computing systems (at least col. 6, lines 40-52; planning response time for target system).

As per Claim 7. The method of Claim 6 further comprising altering the workload in the processing environment to change the expiration date relative to the target

Art Unit: 2157

planning date for at least two of said plurality of computer systems (at least col. 6, lines 40-52; quality of service attributes associated with capacity planning).

As per Claim 8. The method of Claim 6 further comprising the steps of:

creating a From list of computer systems for which the expiration date precedes the at least one planning date (at least col. 7, lines 30-67);

creating a To list of computer systems for which the expiration date is later than said least one planning date (at least col. 7, lines 30-67); and

reassigning workload units from computer systems on said From list to computer systems on said To list based on said impact values (at least col. 7, lines 30-67; issue / reassessing current assignment based on expected value for the workload distribution).

As per Claim 9. The method of Claim 8 further comprising calculating new expiration dates for computer systems on said From and said To lists after said reassigning (at least col. 7, lines 30-67; col. 8, lines 26-54; computing p-quantile to be lowered than desired bound T).

As per Claim 11. The apparatus of Claim 10 further comprising at least one storage location accessible by the administrative processor for storing data relating said plurality of computer systems (at least col. 6, lines 3-20; virtual store).

Claims 10 and 12-20 do not add or define any additional limitations over claims 1-9 and 11 and therefore are rejected for similar reasons.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Art Unit: 2157

4. Applicant's arguments filed 07 February 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicants argue, substantially, that Borowsky fails to teach a step for assigning a plurality of impact values and that Borowsky simply determines the length of time for a host to complete work

In response to Applicant arguments, Borowsky teaches plural workloads, thus more than one workload unit, wherein a target system is to meet certain quality-of-service attributes to be able to perform accordingly given configuration details of the system. Borowsky teaches that such an assessment can be given via monitoring and measuring an existing and predicting growth trends by using among other things, workload libraries (at least col. 4, lines 22-43). Such a workload library can include information for typical loads generated by a predetermined number of users, as such impact values in the workload libraries. These values in the library allow analysis and predict an assessment of workload requirements. In addition, the system is then monitored after configuration and workload distribution can be reassessed and issued accordingly thereafter (at least col. 7, lines 30-67). Further, the Specification states "For the purposes present invention, the use of the terms "expiration date" "life expectancy" and "capacity space" will be understood to be mutually-interchangable (sic) alternatives representing measurements of a processing system's capacity" (page 11). Thus, as Borowsky teaches quality-of-service attributes to include capacity and capacity planning to, for example, have a response time of less than T seconds on a target system (at least col. 6, lines 3-52), Borowsky teaches an "expiration date" of a system and workload.

It is noted the paragraph on page 14 of Applicants remarks is incomplete and thus not clear and possible to determine Applicants complete reasoning and arguments toward Borowsky.

### ***Conclusion***

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Newly cited MacFarlane et al, Chafe, Fong et al, and Miller, in addition to previously cited Hartsell et al, Mummert et al, Flockhart et al, and Sanders et al are cited for disclosing pertinent information related to the claimed invention. Applicants are requested to consider the prior art reference for relevant teachings when responding to this office action.

Art Unit: 2157

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gregory G. Todd whose telephone number is (571)272-4011. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 9:00am-6:00pm w/ first Fridays off.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on (571)272-4001. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Gregory Todd

Patent Examiner

Technology Center 2100

  
ARIO ETIENNE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100